

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Spurr (U.S. Patent Number 5,906,123) in view of Rogers (U.S. Patent No. 4,534,191). Claims 1-3 and 8-10 have been cancelled. Claims 4, 6, 11, 19 and 21 have been amended to depend on claim 22, and therefore dependent claims 5, 7, 12, 13 and 20 also depend on claim 22. Therefore, pending claims 4-7, 11-13 and 19-21 depend on claim 22 are not obvious over Spurr in view of Rogers.

Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Spurr in view of Rogers and further in view of Cutler (U.S. Patent No. 6,025,048). Claim 15 has been amended to depend on claim 22, and therefore dependent claims 16 and 17 also depend on claim 22. Therefore, pending claims 15-17 depend on claim 22 are not obvious over Spurr in view of Rogers and Cutler.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Spurr in view of Rogers and further in view of Cutler. Spurr discloses a vehicle door latch assembly 10 including a rotatable claw 12 which coacts with a striker 14. A pawl 16 retains the claw 12 in engagement with the striker 14 to keep a door closed. The claw 12 and the pawl 16 are pivoted on a metal back plate 22 secured to the door. Rogers discloses a security lock for sliding doors. The Examiner states that Rogers discloses a bolt 6 formed of a plurality of laminations. Cutler discloses a complex hybrid ceramic matrix composite laminate 10 including ceramic layers 12 and CMC layers 14 that include fibers that can be aligned unidirectionally or multi-directionally. The Examiner contends that it would be obvious to employ a fiber structure as suggested by Cutler in the combination of Spurr and Rogers to establish different profiles.


The combination of Spurr, Rogers and Cutler does not suggest Applicant's claims. Applicant is claiming one of a latch bolt or a pawl made from a plurality of laminations. The profile of one of the laminations is different from the profile of the other laminations. Cutler suggests a laminate 10 including fibers that can be aligned in a unidirectional or a multi-directional pattern. However, Cutler does not disclose or suggest that the layers 12 and 14 of the laminate 10 have different profiles. As shown in Figure 1, the layers 12 and 14 of the laminate 10 have the same profile. Cutler only suggests that the pattern of the fibers in the layers 12 and

14 can be unidirectional or multidirectional and does not suggest that the layers 12 and 14 have different profiles. Applicant's claims are not obvious in view of the combination of Spurr, Rogers and Cutler, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Thus, claims 4-7, 11-13 and 15-27 are in condition for allowance. If any additional fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C., for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment. Therefore, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

**CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.**




Karin H. Butchko  
Registration No. 45,864  
Attorneys for Applicant  
400 West Maple Road, Suite 350  
Birmingham, Michigan 48009  
(248) 988-8360

Dated: July 22, 2003

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that the above referenced documents are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 22, 2003



Amy M. Spaulding